

MINUTES

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF BRIGHTON
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
4363 BUNO ROAD
BRIGHTON, MI 48114**

**OCTOBER 3, 2016
REGULAR WORKSESSION MEETING
7:00 P.M.
(810) 229.0560**

Supervisor T. Murphy called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. The Pledge of Allegiance was said.
Present. T. Murphy, Supervisor; A. Bollin, Clerk; D. Hawk, Treasurer; M. Slaton, Trustee; C. Doughty, Trustee; L. Weaire, Trustee
Absent: P. Michel, Trustee

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Barb Potocki, Woodland Shore Drive – Genoa Township sidewalks extend to the City of Brighton, does Brighton Township plan to do this on the west side of the City of Brighton?

Cheryl Guard, Woodland Shore Drive – Emailed Manager on 8-19-16 about SELCRA and again on 9-27-16 asking if there was a conflict of interest for joint board members of SELCRA and BTBT and asked for a response but has not received a response from the Manager. What legal authority did the Township have to cancel the Annual Town meeting back in 1995?

Bob Potocki, Woodland Shore Drive – Distributed handout; commented on purchase of expert services; use State and County resources; protect health and safety of community; rezoning of Ravines and Woodland Lake Bridge.

Mike Palmer, East Grand River Ave – Echoed previous comments regarding engineering services; objects to revisions to Admin Policy #709. BTBT has been misrepresented at St. Pat's; agrees there is a conflict of interest with SELCRA; Brighton Area Schools and SELCRA have overlapping services.

Jim Sarna, Woodland Shore Drive – Disappointed with SELCRA vote; conflict of interest of dual board members.

Anna Chatten, Woodland Shore Drive – Allotted 3 minutes to Barb Potocki.

Barb Potocki, Woodland Shore Drive – Raised concerns over whether a conflict of interest existed for Township Board members that also voted as members of the SELCRA Board.

AGENDA

A. Bollin moved and C. Doughty seconded **to adopt the agenda as presented.**
Motion carried.

BILLS

C. Doughty asked who pays for the legal services bill from Dykema given it is litigation over sewers. Manager Vick explained the costs were allocated to the General Fund because there were monies budgeted for legal services whereas there was not money budgeted for the unanticipated litigation in the Sewer Fund and a budget amendment would be needed. Discussion ensued regarding appropriately allocating the costs, bill due date, past related invoices, request confirmation that the charges can/should be allocated to the sewer fund, similar expenses are charged to respective department or fund, and staff recommendation.

A. Bollin moved and D. Hawk seconded **to approve the bills be paid conditional upon requesting that the Manager confirm with the appropriate consultants that the sewer related litigation charges can be allocated to the Sewer Fund and if it is the Sewer Admin Fund what appropriate line item it is and upon that bring forth the necessary budget amendment.**

Ayes: A. Bollin, D. Hawk, L. Weaire, C. Doughty, T. Murphy
 Nays: M. Slaton
 Motion carried.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION – Proposed Revisions to Administrative Policy # 709, Special Assessment District Parameters

Manager Vick introduced the proposed changes and summarized previous discussions on SAD parameters; processes and policies. Discussion included vacant lots that later get built on; are vacant properties used to meet the signature threshold (no); inability to collect chargebacks from new property owner of foreclosed property; reapportionment of unpaid assessments; will the reapportionment apply to all SAD's or just current; reapportionment has been allowable all along but not done; differences between improvement v. maintenance SAD's specifically how and when the monies get collected and spent; consideration of different assessment amounts for lake improvement districts for lakefront v. off the lake property owners; no advance funding or advisory petitions per board discussion; deleting the reference to the fiscal year in # 5; reference to established guidelines for current road funds; desire for discussions to continue with the Livingston County Road Commission on what their long term plan is and what is included in their asset management plan as previously discussed; township will not pursue bonding for subdivision roads; confirmed reasons for thresholds for amounts was due to costs involved in administering the SAD's; currently no administrative fee is charged for the special assessment districts other than the direct costs in the first year; primary, secondary and public subdivision roads under the jurisdiction of the LCRC should be maintained or improved under a County bond not a Township bond; and timing of advanced funding discussions should be during the budget cycle. Consensus was to move forward with the proposed changes under # 3, delete the reference to the fiscal year in # 5, and the Township will not participate in cost sharing for SAD's.

The Board took a short recess at 8:15 P.M.

The Board returned at 8:25 P.M.

STATUS OF ENGINEERING SERVICES – Request for Qualifications

Manager Vick provided background on the bidding process stating the bid had been open for three (3) weeks and briefly described the anticipated interview and selection process. Staff confirmed the contract expiration date, this was a Request for Qualifications, and suggested a current contract extension based on the timing of the selection process. Discussion included request for the fees to be submitted under separate cover, why were the 2013 wastewater treatment flows included in the Request for Qualifications?, extending the current contract since it expires on October 17, 2016, publishing notice of RFQ availability/extension and extending the submittal deadline.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION - SELCRA Articles of Incorporation

Manager Vick summarized the process of adopting amendments to the SELCRA Articles of Incorporation and led discussion on the proposed changes. Discussion included the definition of participating members; clarification on the per participant fee; future funding model; defining member contribution; time frame for receiving SELCRA's proposed budget should be revised to allow for the budget cycle for the Charter Townships (proposed date is too late in budget cycle); per participant rate included in the proposed Articles does not reflect the most recent or current rate; how participants are counted; funding if additional municipalities decide to join; at-large members should live within the participating member communities; number of board members; role of the liaisons; adding language that if a millage is pursued it has to be approved by voters in all participating municipalities; upcoming presentation by the SELCRA Director; and possible future joint meeting with Green Oak Board. Upon review it was verified that the proposed Articles included in the packet were not the latest version. Conclusion was Board will continue its review following the presentation and upon receipt of the correct version of the revised Articles of Incorporation.

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Barb Potocki, Woodland Shore Drive – How can BTBT approve “perpetual participation” as noted in the SELCRA documents?

Page 2 of 3

Charter Township of Brighton –BTBT

Minutes – October 3, 2016 RW

Approved – October 17, 2016

ADJOURNMENT

L. Weaire moved and D. Hawk seconded to adjourn. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Ann M. Bollin, CMC, CMMC, Clerk

Thomas E. Murphy, Supervisor